

Re: RM-10740

Dear Reviewer:

The inappropriateness of this petition on technical grounds is articulated well in other comments. Permit me to address the allegations of present harm and future threat to the Amateur Service, from which the petitioners seek relief and protection.

One might expect the petition to contain compelling discussion to enlighten the reader on the serious nature of these claims, supported by exhibits and evidence. I contend the material lacks substance, is vague and is heavy with innuendo bordering on manipulation at worst, fantasy at best.

The petition makes reference to "One Group appearing on Amateur bands during international radio contests ... to splatter purposely in order to provide themselves with elbowroom during a contest on a very crowded band".

Splatter is a commonly used term to describe spurious RF emissions which extend beyond the passband of a transmitter. By definition, splatter is not a function of a properly operating transmitter's emission bandwidth (which the petition wishes to affect) and is not germane to the petition's request for Rule Making. Part 97 rules already address splatter.

Implicit in the petitioners' statement is damage having been done to someone. There is no identification of when this happened or who was involved; identities of injured parties; or what, if any Commission enforcement actions were taken under existing rules concerning intentional interference. If the goal of a petition is to bring certain facts to the forefront, where are they?

Contests generally entail high-volume use of radio spectrum and with them comes suspension of ordinary operating conventions including spacing between signals. Adjacent channel interference is heightened during these times and accepted by the participants. With signal spacing of 1 kHz or less during many contests, emission bandwidth of any Amateur phone transmitter is made moot, for all practical purposes.

The petition makes reference to "up to twenty complaints per week submitted to the Commission as the result of operations by "Another Group". This claim is not supported. There is no indication of the number of weeks, total number of complaints, or total number of individuals making the alleged complaints as of the time the petition was filed.

The petition attempts to justify the need for Rule Making "so the many thousands of Amateurs who use the Amateur bands reasonably can obtain relief from and protection against ... actions described".

It is a disservice to the Commission and to the Amateur Service to argue with numbers that cannot be substantiated. The petition offers no evidence that many thousands of Amateurs need or want this so-called protection. Absent is anything to indicate that the petitioners' assertions reflect the views, experiences or regulatory needs of Amateur Radio at large.

The petition exaggerates its case in saying "Until recently, amateurs were self-policing ... "

Someone who doesn't happen to be a licensed Amateur could read that to mean the radio service has somehow lost its grip. Please be assured the majority of Amateurs are self-regulating and are fully capable of solving operational disagreements most often without intervention from the Enforcement Bureau and certainly without need for revisions to the United States Federal Code of Regulations.

While the petition concludes the above referenced paragraph with redemption of the vast majority of other amateurs, it again refers to the real target of its effort, Two Groups. This petition is asking the Commission to undertake Rule Making affecting an entire radio service on the punitive wishes of two individuals against two groups of individuals. I join the others calling this a tempest in a tea pot. I hope you will call it frivolous and deserving of immediate dismissal.

The petition speculates "the communications capacity of the radiotelephony bands may be reduced to the point where emergency communications could be hampered or made impossible by splatter from broad and overmodulated stations".

The petition overestimates its case and underestimates the communications capacity of the Amateur Service. Without respect to emission bandwidths, the propagation characteristics of many Amateur bands permit simultaneous utilization of spectrum by multiple users in diverse geographic regions. When simultaneous operations are not practical, on or near a given frequency, Amateurs are proficient in the use of frequency-agile equipment in locating useable frequencies to accomplish the desired communications. The communications capacity of the Amateur Service is inestimable, making it an enormous national resource.

The petition speculates about interference to emergency communications. Attempt is made here to press sensitive hot-buttons at a time when we are all concerned about national security and the US communications infrastructure. The Amateur Service has an outstanding history of public service in emergency communications. Our pool of trained radio operators can rapidly deploy strategic communications techniques and widespread coordinated efforts to efficiently handle emergency communications. The petition seeks to characterize emission bandwidth as a threat while ignoring the exemplary track record of Amateurs who respond appropriately in times of emergency, regardless of the transmitting equipment they are using.

The petition fails to offer factual information from which one could reasonably conclude the presence of harm or threat, or the need for protection and remedy from same. I respectfully ask that the Commission dismiss RM-10740 at its earliest convenience.

Michael K. Wingfield
6931 Ryan Road
Medina, OH 44256

Amateur Radio License W8MW
General Radiotelephone Operator License PG-15-4930